b. biguttata and b. pallens and is perhaps an incipient species, it is not regarded as specifically distinct at the present time because it 1) possesses no more than minor structural differentiation and 2) differs in color from b. biguttata to a lesser degree than does the definitely subspecific b. pallens. Furthermore, the possibility that b. bivirgata and at least b. biguttata are connected by a continuous interbreeding population has by no means been eliminated.

Remarks: Cantharis alfredi may be regarded as an objective junior synonym of bivirgata as it was proposed, in effect, merely as a new name for the latter. In describing bivirgata in 1881 Eugenio Dugès credited the name to his brother, Alfredo. In redescribing the same form in 1889 Eugenio Dugès was apparently under the impression that he had used the name alfredi in his earlier paper as he cited his original description under that name and cited "C. bivirgata Alf. Dug." in synonymy as a manuscript name.

The type locality of *b. bivirgata* is Silao, Guanajuato. Dugès also recorded the subspecies from Tupátaro, Guanajuato. Specimens examined: 3.

## ON THE RENDERING OF CHARLES De GEER'S SURNAME.

By Ashley B. Gurney,\* Washington, D. C.

One of the outstanding pioneer entomologists of the 18th century was Charles De Geer (1720–1778), whose name appears almost daily as the describer of the red-legged grasshopper, *Mclanoplus femur-rubrum* (De G.), and numerous other common insects. Unfortunately, writers are not consistent in rendering De Geer's surname, so that DeGeer, Degeer, de Geer, Geer, and other forms are used. An example of varying usage among North American entomologists is found in the official list of Common Names of Insects. The abbreviation DeG. was used in the 1908, 1925, and 1931 editions of the list, and Deg. in 1937, 1942, 1946, and 1950. The current 1956 list (Bull. Ent. Soc. Amer., vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 1–34) returns to DeG. An important minority group of writers uses Degeer, and they are convinced that this form is in accordance with

<sup>\*</sup> Entomology Research Branch, Agricultural Research Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The lists were issued by the American Association of Economic Entomologists, in the Journal of Economic Entomology, prior to 1956.

De Geer's own wishes, according to the statement of the German entomologist Johann A. E. Goeze² (1731–1793) who translated from the French and edited the German edition of De Geer's famous work, "Memoirs pour servir a l'histoire des Insectes." While the lack of uniformity in rendering the surname may seem trivial, the exactness which we try to achieve in the scientific names of animals warrants this attempt to determine the correct spelling. As a result of this study, it is concluded that De Geer is the correct rendering of the surname.

Since most usage of the Degeer form is based on one or both of the two statements published by Goeze, it is desirable to quote them here, followed by translations which have been prepared by Miss Ruth Ericson of the Entomology Research Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

"Den Namen des Herrn von Geer hab 'ich in dem Werke selbst von Geer, de Geer, von Geerisch, unrecht geschrieben, indem es Degeer, Degeerisch heissen muss, weil mir dieser berühmte Naturforscher selbst gemeldet hat, dass das de in seinem Namen nicht der Deutschen von sey; sondern wesentlich zu demselben gehöre."
—Goeze (1777, p. xiv)

Translation—In the Work (or volume or article) itself I have incorrectly written the name of Herr von Geer as von Geer, de Geer, von Geerisch, while it must be called Degeer, Degeerisch, because this famous naturalist himself informed me that the de in his name is not the German von; but it is essentially part of the

same [i. e., the name].

"'Nachricht.—Der im verwichenen Jahre im Herrn entschlafene Verfasser, bezeigte mir schriftliche seine Zufriedenheit über meine Uebersetzung des Insektenwerkes, zugleich aber ersuchte er mich, seinem Namen künstig nicht mehr von Geer zu schreiben, oder ein neues Insekt von Geerisch zu nennen, sondern alleseit Degeer, degeerisch zu schreiben, weil diese De nicht der Teutschen von sey, sondern wesentlich zu seinem Namen gehöre, welches ich hierdurch, wie billig, dem Publikum anzeigen wollen.—Göze.'"
—Goeze, in De Geer (1779).3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Written Göze in the volume by De Geer (1779).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Coe (1943) referred to the statement by Goeze (in De Geer, 1779) and said that it appears "in the form of a notice preceding the text, i. e., following title-page and general index." A copy of the work belonging to the University of Minnesota Library has been borrowed, but no such statement appears in it. In response to an inquiry concerning the exact place where the statement occurs, Mr. Coe has replied that in the copy examined by him the Goeze statement appears on the right hand side of a sheet which

Translation—*Note*—The author who went to sleep in the Lord [died] last year, notified me in writing (or by letter) of his satisfaction with my translation of the Volume on Insects (or Insect Work), but at the same time he requested me not to write his name von Geer any more in the future, or to name a new insect von Geerisch, but always to write Degeer, degeerisch, because this De is not the German von but rather is essentially a part of his name, which I, as is proper, hereby want to make known to the public.—Göze.

Prior to his death in 1778, De Geer evidently saw Volume I of the German edition of his "Memoirs," first published in 1776, as translated and edited by Goeze, who wrote the name as "von Geer" and "de Geer." Since Goeze apparently had supposed the de to be merely a nobiliary particle equivalent to the German von, he used von in some instances. In the same manner he had referred to "Herr von Reaumur." Contrary to this interpretation, De Geer and others of his family have traditionally considered the De as part of the surname, though usually a space is shown between Deand Geer. Therefore, De Geer wrote to Goeze, and the 1777 Goeze statement suggests that De Geer said only that the De was not the equivalent of von and that it was an essential part of the name. is uncertain whether De Geer elaborated his preferences further, but Goeze (1777) inferred that the Degeer form was correct, while in 1779 he stated that this was part of the author's request. It seems quite possible that Goeze, sincerely wishing to avoid the use of dc in the sense of a nobiliary particle, and unaccustomed to a capital letter in the middle of German surnames, wrote his own interpretation into the 1779 statement as part of De Geer's specific request. My discussion will be devoted mainly to a review of the situation and

immediately follows a sheet presenting the table of contents (Verzeichniss). On the right hand side of the Verzeichniss sheet, near the bottom of the unnumbered page, is a sketch of a bee-hive with three bees flying away. The Minnesota copy lacks the sheet following the "bee-hive" page, and there is no indication that a sheet has been removed. A further sign that individual copies of the Goeze translation may have varied is the statement by Schmidt-Gobel (1876, p. 149) that he was told that some colored examples existed, though he himself had not seen them.

<sup>4</sup> The cooperation of the various individuals whose assistance is mentioned throughout the paper is gratefully acknowledged. The benefit of their assistance and judgment has been very helpful. A copy of this manuscript was sent to Mr. R. L. Coe, and he agreed (in litt., June 27, 1956) that Goeze's statements are not entirely reliable.

the evidence pointing to the likelihood that Goeze's own interpretation entered strongly into the 1779 statement.

Writers referring to one or both of the Goeze statements in support of the Degeer form include Schmidt-Gobel (1876, p. 149), Schulz (1906, p. 237), Dimmock (1906, footnote p. 322), Clément (1910), Wheeler (1931, footnote p. 31), Balfour-Browne (1938, footnote p. 6), and Coe (1943). Other references of a similar nature may have escaped my attention. All of the above writers except Coe referred to Goeze briefly. Balfour-Browne stated "Goerze (sic!), Ent. Beytrage, 1777, I, xiv, states that Degeer himself told him that this is the correct spelling of his name instead of 'De Geer'," when, in fact, Goeze did not make that exact statement. It was Dr. Joseph Bequaert who invited Wheeler's attention to the Clément reference, which in turn was responsible for Wheeler's adoption of the Degeer form. Coe's explanation is much the fullest, though still lacking the support of Swedish sources, such as genealogies, the examination of which Coe suggested might be helpful. It appears that the adoption of Deg. in the 1937, 1942, 1946, and 1950 lists of the Common Names of Insects is traceable to an acquaintance with Dimmock's note, on the part of coleopterists at the U. S. National Museum, and a consequent acceptance of the views expressed by Goeze (1777).

Horn (1926, p. 50) treated the surname as Geer, perhaps reflecting the opinion that *de* was fully comparable to *von*. Horn and Schenkling (1928–1929, *I*: 247; 2: 403) adopted Degeer, probably a sign that Goeze's views were accepted, and Horn and Kahle

(1935, pp. 4, 52, pl. 14) continued the use of Degeer.

In De Geer's principal work (1752–1778), published in Stockholm, the full name CHARLES DE GEER appears on the title page. Spacing occurs in the surname, but due to the use of capital letters no further preference in the rendering of the name is evident. Concerning other De Geer works, his paper on the "worm-lion" (De Geer, 1752), published in Stockholm, has been seen in the original. The author's name appears as CARL DE GEER, and it also is given in the same way in a list of members at the front of the volume. A paper on a cranefly by De Geer (1773), published at Upsala 5 years before the entomologist's death, has been consulted in the original. Presumably it reflects De Geer's usage during his later years, and it doubtless was not subject to faulty typesetting by foreign printers unfamiliar with the author's name. The latinized form CAROLO DE GEER appears on the paper, and in the list of authors represented in the volume CAROL. DE GEER is used Dr. K. Princis of Lund, Sweden, the well known student of cockroaches, has written (in litt., April 4, 1954), "There is no doubt that De Geer himself used the form De Geer and so do also all the Swedish entomologists without exception. The form Degeer appeared for the first time in the German translation by Goeze, although there is a clear space between De and Geer in the original edition." This evidence should more than counterbalance the inference by Coe (1943) that the printed form of De Geer's name appearing with his work is not a basis for opinion due to the fact that he did not always see proof of papers published outside of Sweden.

Through the kind cooperation of Dr. Felix Bryk of Stockholm, and of the Swedish Academy of Science, I have obtained a photocopy of a letter written by De Geer to the Swedish Academy in 1742. The closing portion of the letter, clearly showing a capital D and a capital G., is reproduced in fig. 1. In this specimen of De

Leufste J. S. Martin, Joseph Linurum, Einwenn, 1742.

Fig. 1. Closing portion of a letter written by Charles De Geer, the entomologist, belonging to the Swedish Academy of Science. Traced by the author from a photocopy furnished by Dr. Felix Bryk. A free translation is as follows: "Leufsta the 8th March 1742. The obedient servant of the honorable gentlemen."

Geer's handwriting no spacing occurs between parts of the name, including the given name, but spacing is amply evident from the title page of his work and from usage of his friends Reaumur and Linnaeus, as well as that of present-day descendants of his line (Leufsta) of the De Geer family.

During De Geer's life he was rather close to the great French naturalist, Reaumur, and considerable correspondence passed between them, though Caullery (1955, p. 42) reports the failure to learn that any letters from Reaumur to De Geer are preserved in the De Geer family archives. However, in his paper on the "worm-

lion," Reaumur (1753) twice referred to his friend as "M. de Geer," evidently demonstrating that Reaumur was accustomed to present the parts of the surname separately. Probably the French influence was responsible for the use of a small d. Linnaeus, a fellow-countryman and friend, used the form De Geer in the 10th Edition of the Systema Naturae, 1758.

The Baroness Ebba-Hult De Geer, of Stockholm, a member of the Leufsta branch, which began with the famous entomologist, has shown in correspondence with me that the correct form of the surname includes spacing, though in handwriting or typing it is not always observed. She has most kindly furnished a copy of the signature of De Geer's son (fig. 2), which clearly shows that in 1788



Fig. 2. Copy of a signature of Charles De Geer, son of the entomologist, made from a tracing presented to the U. S. National Museum by the Baroness Ebba-Hult De Geer.

he capitalized both D and G. Presumably the practice was followed by the family during his father's life.

It is true that some variation in the use of the surname has occurred. Dr. Bryk has consulted the minutes of the Swedish Academy of Science, and reports that during the early years (1739-1741) of De Geer's association with the Academy his name was variously recorded as Degér, Deger, Degeer, and DeGeer [Secretary's records, not De Geer signatures]. Later, De Geer apparently was used consistently in the Academy records. Mr. Sven Lundgren, a consultant on Swedish biography in the Library of Congress, has explained to me that the use of a small d, in such names, is a privilege accorded nobility in Sweden. I have been informed by the Baroness that in the Leufsta branch of the family there has privately been some use of the small d, but in the peerage the name was entered with the capital D until 1947.

The non-Swedish influence or attitude toward the name is shown by Caullery (1955) who uses the name Charles de Geer, clearly following the French custom, as also shown in such names as "de Lanux" and "de Custine." Perhaps the French custom influenced Duncan (1848, pp. 59-66), in his rather noteworthy "Memoir of DE GEER." to refer to him as Charles de Geer and Baron De Geer. apparently using a capital D only when the surname was not combined with a first or "given" name. Among French entomologists the use of "de" in De Geer's name is not uniform, however. Bonnet (1952) has pointed out that forms of the name other than De Geer, including the form Degeer in the German translation of the "Memoirs," are erroneous. Dr. Lucien Chopard uses De Geer regularly in his papers. Dr. René Malaise of Stockholm has pointed out (in litt., Dec. 18, 1952) that non-Swedish families with names like "de Jongh" and "de Grade," who have recently arrived in Sweden, are inclined to use that form, in contrast with Swedish De Geers. He has cited the Stockholm telephone register as demonstrating these distinctions.

Although most differences in the rendering of De Geer's name involve the way "de" is combined with "Geer," the "De" sometimes has been eliminated entirely by later entomologists. As an example, Kevan (1952, p. 169) states that the name was Charles Geer, and he cites Willemse (1917) in support of that view. Willemse (1917, p. 17) had commented "Gewoonlijk wordt DE Geer of Degeer geschreven. Dit is echter minder juist. Zijn naam was Geer." (Ordinarily DE Geer or Degeer was written. However, this is less exact. His name was Geer.—Translation by Miss Ericson.) In the light of all the evidence here presented, the omission of "De" is unwarranted. The Baroness De Geer has commented to me that members of the families of von Rosen, af Ugglas, etc., may be referred to as Count Rosen, Count Ugglas, or Baron Essen, but never a Baron Geer, instead always De Geer, so tightly does the prefix constitute an essential part of the name.

Dr. Felix Bryk, who has made a detailed study of De Geer, has written (in litt., March 2, 1956) that he considers Goeze's rendering of the name wrong. It seems quite probable that Goeze was influenced by German customs. On page 6 and elsewhere of De Geer (1779), Goeze referred to Reammur as "Herr von Reammur," since the French entomologist often was called "de Reammur," though "de" was not an essential part of the surname. In the same way Goeze sought to Germanize De Geer's name in the first volume of the translation, with the result that De Geer asked him not to write "von Geer." It may be noted that the requests ascribed to De Geer in the two Goeze statements do not agree entirely, and my inference is that Goeze added his own interpretation to the request. De Geer

probably did not go so far as to request that his name be written Degeer, as Goeze said in 1779, but did not say in 1777.

The authoritative Swedish genealogy by Elgenstierna (1926) consistently used the surname De Geer. Nordenskiöld (1920–24) gave the name as Charles De Geer, though the English translation<sup>5</sup> by Eyre (Nordenskiöld, 1928) used the surname "de Geer."

Specific and generic names originating as patronymics based on De Geer's name have appeared in numerous forms. Bonnet (1952) reported a survey of those forms, including the 22 different ways in which the specific name of one common spider had been written by different authors. Since the Rules provide for a single word consisting of small letters, including the initial one, degecri is the correct specific patronymic. If the name of a person on whose name a patronymic is based contains a nobiliary particle, as "de Lessert," the specific name may be formed either with or without the particle (delesserti or lesserti). In the case of De Geer, the particle is not strictly a nobiliary one, but a definite part of the surname, so that degecri is the result. Concerning generic names, a single word, of which the initial letter is capitalized, is the correct form, hence Degecria and Degecriella.

## References

- Balfour-Browne, Frank 1938. Systematic notes upon British aquatic Coleoptera. Vol. I, Hydradephaga. pp. 1–95, figs. 1–29. London.
- Bonnet, Pierre 1952. Sur l'application de l'article 13 des règles de nomenclature. (Lettre initiale minuscule de tous les noms d'espèce). L'Entomologiste, vol. 8, pp. 57–60.
- Bryk, Felix 1952. (Charles De Geer, pp. 113–121) in Swedish Men of Science 1650–1950, edited by Sten Lindroth, pp. 1–295, Stockholm.
- Caullery, Maurice 1955. Les Papiers laissés par de Reaumur et le Tome VII des Mémoires pour servir a l'Histoire des Insectes. Encycl. Ent., Suppl. au vol. 32, pp. 1–63.
- Clément, Ernst 1910. Über den Autornamen "Degeer" und eine von Degeer beschriebene Ichneumoniden-Species. Zool.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The 1928 translation is readily available, much more so in the United States than the original Swedish edition. I am indebted to Mr. Herman H. Henkle, Librarian of the John Crerar Library, of Chicago, for checking the form used by Nordenskiöld. This change during translation is an example of how misunderstandings have arisen with respect to De Geer's name.

- Anzeig., vol. 35, pp. 521-523.
- Coe, R. L. 1943. Charles Degeer: The correct rendering of his surname. Ent. Monthly Mag., vol. 79, pp. 151–152.
- De Geer, Charles 1752. Rön om Mask-Lejonet. Kongl. Svenska Vetenskaps Acad. Handl., vol. 13, pp. 180–192, tab. 5.
- - ——1776–1783. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Insekten aus dem Franzosischen übersetz und mit Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Johann August Ephraim Göze. (Author shown in 1779 as Herrn Baron Karl Degeer). In 7 volumes, volume 2 with 2 parts. (Bd. 2, Th. 2, Nurnberg, pp. 1–384, 43 pls., 1779, is the critical one, some copies of which include an unnumbered page in front bearing an unsigned statement by the editor about De Geer's name.)
- Dimmock, George W. 1906. Algunas Coccinellidae de Cuba. Tomado del Primer Informe Anual de la Estacion Central Agronomica de Cuba, pp. 287–392.
- **Duncan, James** 1848. Introduction to Entomology. Vol. 28, 331 pp., 35 pls., *in*: The Naturalist's Library, edited by William Jardine.
- Elgenstierna, Gustaf 1926. Den Introducerade Svenska Adelns Ättarlavler. Vol. II, Chapman-Fagerstrale (De Geers on pp. 194–218. Leufsta line 213–217), Stockholm.
- Goeze, Johann August Ephraim 1777. Entomologische Beyträge zu des Ritter Linné swolften ausgabe des Natursystems. Teil 1: xvi & 736 pp.
- Horn, Walther 1926 Über den Verbleib der entomologischen Sammlungen der Welt (ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Entomo-Museologie. Suppl Ent., Deutsch. Ent. Mus., vol. 12, pp. 1–133.
- Horn, Walther & Kahle, Ilse 1935. Über entomologische Sammlungen. Ent. Beihefte, vol. 2, pp. 1–160, 16 pls.
- Horn, Walther & Schenkling, Sigm. 1928-1929. 1udex Litterature Entomologicae. Serie 1: Die Welt-Literatur über die gesamte Entomologie bis inklusive 1863. vol. 1, pp. 1–352, 1928; 2, pp. 353–704, 1928; 3, pp. 705-1056, 1928; 4, pp. 1057–1426, 1929. Berlin.
- Kevan, D. Keith McE. 1952. A summary of the recorded dis-

tribution of British Orthopteroids. Trans. Soc. Brit. Ent., vol. 11, pp. 165–180.

Nordenskiöld, Erik 1920–1924. Biologins Historia. 3 volumes. Stockholm.

Reaumur, R. A. F. de. 1753. Histoire du ver-lion. Hist. Mem. Acad. Rov. Sci., Paris, pp. 402-419, pl. 17.

Schmidt-Göbel, H. M. 1876. Zusätze und Berichtigungen zu Hagen's Bibliotheca Entomologica. Deutsche Ent. Zeit., vol. 20, pp. 145–160. (Same periodical as Berl. Ent. Zeit.)

Schulz, W. A. 1906. Spolia Hymenopterologica. pp. 1–355, illus. Paderborn.

Wheeler, William Morton 1931. Demons of the Dust. pp. 378, 49 figs. London. (An American edition was published in 1930.)

Willemse, C. 1917. Orthoptera Neerlandica. De rechtvleugelige insecten van Nederland en het aangrenzend gebied. Tijdsch. Ent., vol. 60, pp. 1–176, figs. 1–80.

## NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

The current subscription to the **Bulletin** of \$3.50 was established in 1942 and although there have been many increases in printing costs since that time, The Society has been able to absorb the annual deficits through sales of reprints and in other ways. Because of the present exceedingly high publication costs, the Society feels that a modest increase in subscription now is warranted. Beginning with Vol. 52, for 1957, the subscription rate per volume will be \$4.00 (domestic) and \$4.25 (foreign).